



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Adress: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/573,787	03/28/2006	Andre Chojnacki	127563	5450
25944	7590	06/30/2009	EXAMINER	
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 320850 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320-4850			GORDON, BRIAN R	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		1797		
		MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE
		06/30/2009		PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/573,787	<b>Applicant(s)</b> CHOJNACKI ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b> Brian R. Gordon	<b>Art Unit</b> 1797

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Brian R. Gordon. (3) Smith Sirisakorn.

(2) Linda Saltiel. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 26 June 2009.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference  
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 7-12.

Identification of prior art discussed: Wilmes and Kido.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The examiner explained that the proposed claims were insufficient to overcome the previous rejections. The examiner also pointed out that claims 7-8 were replete with clarity issues and suggested language that would clarify the claims. The examiner noted the driving means is not an invocation of 112(6). Applicant stated the examiner's comments and suggestion would be taken into consideration.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Brian R Gordon/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1797